

Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed March 23, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims. To further the prosecution of this application, Applicant submits the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8 and 17-23 are pending in this application and stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. In particular, claims 1-4 and 7 stand rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,381,492 (Steingroever) in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,158,797 (Andrews) and claims 17-23 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Steingroever in view Andrews and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,124,776 (Aiello). Applicant respectfully traverses all of these rejections and no claims have been amended herein.

It should be noted that the Office Action never explicitly rejects claim 8. In any event, claim 8 depends from claim 1 and is patentable for at least the reasons given below with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Applicants note with appreciation that claims 5 and 6 were deemed allowable if rewritten in independent form such that they include all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1-8

Claim 1 is directed to a magnetizing fixture for connection to an electrical power supply. The fixture of claim 1 includes, *inter alia*, an electrically conductive core of substantial magnetic permeability.

Steingroever in combination with Andrews fails to teach or suggest an electrically conductive core of substantial magnetic permeability as recited by claim 1. Instead, element 25 (identified as the core in the Office Action) is actually an electrically conductive ring-shaped

bridge member that electrically connects conductors 22a and 22b (Col. 3, lines 19-24). There is no teaching or suggestion that this bridge (which is not a core at all) has substantial magnetic permeability. For at least this reason, claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Steingroever and Andrews. Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and, therefore, are patentable for at least the same reason.

Claims 17-23

Claim 17 is directed to a magnetizing fixture that includes a conductive element forming an interior and that is capable of receiving power from a power source. The fixture of claim 17 also includes a conductive core of substantial magnetic permeability within the interior of the conductive element. The fixture of claim 17 also includes an insulator that prevents electrical contact between at least a portion of the conductive element and the conductive core.

Steingroever in combination with Andrews and further in view of Aiello fails to teach or suggest either a conductive core of substantial magnetic permeability or an insulator preventing electrical contact between the conductive element and the conductive core as required by claim 17. As above, element 25 of Steingroever (identified as the core in the Office Action) is an electrically conductive ring and the reference does not teach or suggest that this ring has substantial magnetic permeability. Furthermore, the magnetized steel core 70 taught in Aiello contains conductors 72 passing through it. There is no indication, however that these conductors are isolated from the core as required by claim 17. As such, claim 17 is patentable over the combination of Steingroever, Andrews, and Aiello. Claims 18-23 depend from claim 17 and, therefore, are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that the examiner reconsider this application in view of all of the art. Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and early notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Dated: June 20, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



M. Brad Lawrence
Registration No. 47,210
Attorney for Applicants
Bromberg & Sunstein LLP
125 Summer Street
Boston, MA 02110-1618
(617) 443-9292

00917/00192 379738.1